

REMARKS

Claims 1-10 are currently active.

Claims 19 and 20 have been canceled. The Examiner has objected to the claims. The claims have been amended to obviate these objections.

The Examiner has rejected Claims 1-4, 6-9 and 19-20 as being unpatentable over Montgomery in view of Mullins. Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection.

Referring to Montgomery, there is taught a louver light control. In pertinent part, and referring to figure 4, Montgomery teaches that the louvered light control 10 is supported by the suspended ceiling grid B. A louver frame lip 24 of the louver frame 12 rests within a horizontal portion of the suspended ceiling grid B, which also supports the acoustic ceiling tile C. A housing lip E of the housing D of the fluorescent light fixture A rests on the louver frame lip 24 of the louver frame 12. Thus, that the housing D of the fluorescent light fixture rests on the louver frame lip 24 of the louver frame 12, which dictates that the light fixture is not part of the louver frame 12 to which the louvers are attached. More specifically, Montgomery does not teach or suggest a first shutter rotatably connected to the housing where the housing is in which the light source is disposed.

In fact, Montgomery teaches away from this teaching that the louvers are in a totally distinct structure separate apart from the housing in which the light source is disposed. Because Montgomery fails to teach or suggest this limitation of Claim 1, it is not applicable as a prior art reference. Besides the fact that Montgomery does not teach or suggest any type of reflecting material anywhere, it also fails to teach this critical structural relationship that is claimed by applicants.

Referring to Mullins, there is taught a reflecting material, but it is taught on the fixed louvers that interlock with each other. Mullins teaches away from applicants' claimed invention exactly because the louvers are fixed.

In fact, it is respectfully submitted the applied art of record has nothing to do whatsoever with applicants' claimed invention. Montgomery fails to teach the proper structure relationships of the claimed elements, let alone any type of reflector material, or need for reflective material. Mullins simply teaches a reflector material but in the context of fixed louvers, which has nothing to do with the teachings of applicants' claimed invention or with Montgomery.

Applicants do not suggest they discovered shutters, or rotatable shutters, or reflecting materials. However, applicants do submit that the discovered the very specific relationship of the elements as found in applicants' claimed invention.

It is further respectfully submitted by applicants that the Examiner is using hindsight to arrive at applicants' claimed invention. The Examiner is using the limitations of Claim 1 as a roadmap to attempt to find the different limitations in the different references cited, and having supposedly found them, the Examiner concludes that Claim 1 is arrived at. This is not patent law. Besides the fact that the applied record fails to teach or suggest certain limitations of Claim 1, there is no teaching or suggestion in either reference to combine the teachings of the different references to arrive at applicants' claimed invention, as is also required by patent law.

Moreover, the Examiner is taking the teachings for each reference out of the context in which they are found. The context of each of these references have nothing to do with each other. The Examiner cannot ignore this fact. Fixed louvers with a reflecting material have nothing at all to do with a retrofittable louver assembly which has no reflecting material whatsoever, or has no need of a reflecting material whatsoever.

Accordingly, the applied art of record fails to teach or suggest Claim 1 of applicants.

Claims 2-4 and 6-9 are dependent to parent Claim 1 and are patentable for the reasons Claim 1 is patentable.

The Examiner has rejected Claim 5 as being unpatentable over Montgomery in view of Mullins and further in view of Goebel. In pertinent part, Goebel adds nothing to the teachings of Montgomery or Mullins in regard to the invention of Claim 1. The Examiner cites Goebel simply for the teaching of a gimbal ring and nothing more. Claim 5 is dependent to parent Claim 1 and is patentable for the reasons Claim 1 is patentable.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully requested that the outstanding rejections and objections to this application be reconsidered and withdrawn, and Claims 1-10, now in this application be allowed.

Respectfully submitted,

IRWIN KOTOVSKY, ET AL.

By Ansel M. Schwartz

Ansel M. Schwartz, Esquire  
Reg. No. 30,587  
One Sterling Plaza  
201 N. Craig Street  
Suite 304  
Pittsburgh, PA 15213  
(412) 621-9222

Attorney for Applicants

CERTIFICATE OF MAILING  
I hereby certify that this correspondence  
is being deposited with the U.S. Postal  
Service as first class mail in an envelope  
addressed to: Commissioner for Patents,  
P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-  
1450 on 9/6/06

Ansel M. Schwartz  
Ansel M. Schwartz  
Registration No. 30,587